

# THE RACIAL TRANSFORMATION OF AMERICA

BY MADISON GRANT

THE question of a further restriction of immigration is daily assuming greater importance in the press and in the discussions of public bodies, and the proposed legislation reducing the quota and changing its basis from the census of 1910 to the census of 1890 will be acrimoniously debated during the present session of Congress. It is evident that the general principle of a numerical restriction of immigration into the United States is an established policy and the discussion will turn on the ways and means of accomplishing this end rather than on the principle itself. This indicates a great change of public opinion during the last decade.

Ten years ago there were many who openly urged an absolutely unlimited immigration into this country while nominally conceding the desirability of forbidding the entry of the insane, criminal and diseased. The old American idea, inherited from the nineteenth century, of the efficacy of the Melting Pot, still prevailed. Looking back over even a short period of time, it seems strange that this fatuous belief in the all-pervading power of Democracy to obliterate race characters in a single generation could persist so long. One would suppose that our three centuries of experience with the Negro problem would have militated against this very satisfactory self-confidence, but it was not until the passions generated by the Civil War had evaporated that we Americans were able to regard that problem in its true light. When we did so regard it we found we had acquired several similar problems, both racial and religious. The awakening came with the Great War, when Americans were forced to the realization that their country, instead of being a homogeneous whole, was a jumbled-up mass of undigested racial material. They then learned somewhat to their surprise that the country was no longer Anglo-Saxon nor Protestant, and that in some

localities there were indications that it might not continue to be English-speaking.

Americans were shocked to find what a subordinate place was occupied by the old American stock in the opinions of some aliens. An example of this was in a poster issued by some misguided enthusiast in the Treasury Department in one of the appeals for Liberty Loans, showing a Howard Chandler Christy girl of pure Nordic type, pointing with pride to a list of names and saying "AMERICANS ALL". Then follows the list of names:

AMERICANS ALL

Du Bois	Villotto
Smith	Levy
O'Brien	Turovich
Cejka	Kowalski
Haucke	Chriczanevicz
Pappandrikopolous	Knutson
Andrassi	Gonzales

The one native American, apparently, so far as he figures at all, is hidden under the sobriquet of Smith, and there is an implied suggestion that the very beautiful lady is the product of this remarkable Melting Pot.

This awakening of the American consciousness had several results. Desperate efforts were made and still are being made to "Americanize" the immigrant, on the supposition that giving him the vote would in some way alter his outlook on life and wean him from his hereditary predisposition to undermine the Government. The immigrants, to a large extent, belonged to submerged or repressed classes in their native country, and in consequence many of them regarded all governmental control with antipathy. These alien Socialists, Radicals, I. W. W.'s and Bolsheviks served a very useful purpose in rousing Americans to the peril of an increase in their numbers. The danger to the Government, however, is a more or less temporary one, although at the time being it may be very real, owing to the leadership of this group by native American zealots.

A further reaction, awakened by the realization of the number of foreigners living here, took the practical and immediate direction of restrictive immigration measures, the enormous

popularity of which is indicated by the votes that legislation to this end always receives in Congress. In 1917 the literacy test was passed over President Wilson's veto by a vote of 287 to 106 in the House, and a vote of 62 to 19 in the Senate. The present law was passed by a vote of 276 to 33 in the House and 78 to 1 in the Senate. The difficulty lies not in passing such legislation when once before Congress, but in formulating the law, and there are large interests concerned not only in opposing further restriction but in breaking down and making unpopular the existing laws. How subtle and widespread these attacks are one can realize by reading the so-called "sob stuff" in the daily press about "outrages" at Ellis Island. Of course, there are hardships and suffering, inseparable from the operation of any general law,—especially an immigration law,—but why should America be compelled to receive an imbecile child as a potential parent of future Americans because the child's family want to enter? Sympathy of this sort is rampant, but it fails to take into consideration the future. It is only recently that the former president of one of our great universities went on record as saying that rather than separate a family he would urge the admittance of an imbecile child of an ablebodied worker. In other words, the old-fashioned idea is still abroad that the would-be immigrant, as such, has certain inherent rights which the Americans are obliged to recognize. As a matter of fact, the immigrant has no rights whatever except those we choose to give him, and we Americans are perfectly justified in considering our own welfare first.

The forces opposed to restriction are not merely these American sentimentalists but other very practical and important elements. First, the steamship companies have been very active in the past, although their influence in opposing restriction is diminishing. They consider that they have a vested right in transporting live freight and dumping them in this country. From the steamship company's point of view this is perfectly legitimate, but there is not the slightest reason why America should consider the interests of these companies when they conflict with those of the nation.

Next, there are the refuge-of-the-oppressed idealists, many of whom seem to think that there is some analogy between the persecution of, let us say, the Huguenots three hundred years ago

and the racial and religious persecutions which from time to time appear in Eastern Europe. However, both the rights of the steamship companies and the rights of the oppressed, while very influential ten years ago as factors in the question, are of little importance now. The present opponents to restriction are the employers of labour, and the racial groups who want admission for their friends and "relatives". The employers of labour, naturally, seek a large supply of cheap and docile labour for their own immediate industrial needs. This would be all very well if the immigrants did not reproduce their kind. For instance, if we had a contract coolie labour law under which Chinamen could be brought into the country to do their work without bringing in their own women or mixing with the surrounding population, there would be no *racial* objection to their admission. Such a solution, of course, is entirely impractical until we repeal our Contract Labour laws.

Any kind of manual work done by slaves, serfs or immigrants of a low social scale drives out from such employment men of a higher standard of living. In other words, when heavy manual labour is performed by foreigners, as it was by the Irish in the last half of the nineteenth century, or as it is by the Italians and Slavs now, native Americans will not work alongside of them nor accept their standards of living. The work that these immigrants do comes to be regarded as menial and degrading, so that in the next generation the children of the ditch labourer or the servant girl, after education in the public school, refuse to follow in their parents' footsteps and want "white collar" jobs in further competition with the native Americans. The result is that wherever immigrant labour has entered there has been a corresponding fall in the American birth rate, because responsible Americans will not bring children into the world to compete in rough labour with immigrants of a low social standard, and it has been computed that for every immigrant admitted one American was *not* born.

There is little doubt that the population of this country would be substantially as large as it is now if no immigrants whatever had come in during the last hundred years, and it is equally certain that the Americans would not have despised manual

labour as they do now.<sup>1</sup> In parts of the country and in occupations where the competition of the alien is not felt, the native American works cheerfully at the most labourious tasks. The immigrant thus has done a very serious damage to America by teaching our youth to despise hard manual labour. The promotion of Americans into an upper class, resting upon strata of aliens of lower standards, has also had the effect of reducing the native American birth rate. This is a phenomenon universal all over Europe and by no means of recent date. The upper and wealthier classes tend to lower their rate of reproduction while the lower classes continue to breed recklessly.

In addition to driving native Americans out of many occupations, a further injury to the nation has been caused by unrestricted immigration through the introduction of a fast breeding alien population which expands at a rate of increase entirely out of proportion to that of the native Americans. It is not merely a problem of stopping immigration, because we already have here large bodies of people who are racially incompatible with native Americans and who are rapidly replacing the latter. How rapid and complete such a replacement of population can be is illustrated by the following data:

Take two population groups, A and B, and consider their rate of increase with the understanding that only individuals who reproduce themselves are counted, and with the further understanding that for the purposes of this estimate there is no mixture between the groups. Let the two classes be in all cases of equal number at the start, and let us say that A has three children in a given length of time and B has in the same period four children. At the end of one hundred years instead of being fifty per cent. of the population A would be twenty-eight per cent. and B seventy-two per cent., and after three hundred years A would be seven per cent. and B ninety-three per cent. Let us go one step further. If A group marries late in life and has an average generation of thirty-three years, and B group marries earlier and has an average generation of twenty-five years, starting again with equal numbers and both having *equal* numbers of children,

<sup>1</sup>See conclusions of Gen. Francis A. Walker, Superintendent of Census in 1870 and 1880, and data in the memorandum submitted by Earle A. Walcott before the House Immigration Committee in December, 1922.

at the end of one hundred years A would be thirty-three per cent. and B sixty-seven per cent., and at the end of three hundred years the figures would be eleven per cent. against eighty-nine per cent. In actual practice, however, it is found that those who marry early tend to have the larger families. If we add these two cases together, we find that with A having three generations in a century and three children in each generation, and B having four generations to a century and four children, the divergence between the members of these two groups is much greater, because, starting again with equal numbers, in one hundred years A would be seventeen and a half per cent., and B eighty-two and a half per cent., and in three hundred years the figures would be for A nine-tenths of one per cent., and for B ninety-nine and one-tenth per cent. We thus see that early marriages and a slightly larger number of children would in three hundred years totally change the character of a population.

This has been going on in Europe for generations, and since mediæval times the lower classes and races have expanded at the expense of the upper classes, so that many countries which formerly had large Nordic populations, such as Spain and Italy and the provinces of the old Austrian Empire, are almost stripped of their Nordic blood. France, which all through mediæval times down to within a century ago was very Nordic, has reached a point where the Nordic population has shrunk to a hopeless minority in the nation. Germany is feeling the replacement of Nordic by Alpine blood very severely, and many of her foremost thinkers regard her as almost lost to the Nordic race. The great French anthropologist, De Lapouge, stated in conversation with the writer that Germany of today is not nearly so Nordic as France was at the time of the Religious Wars. The case of England, still overwhelmingly Nordic, is also a serious one, because the Industrial Revolution there (as well as in other European countries) has led to a great expansion of the non-Nordic elements—chiefly Mediterranean.

In America the conditions are different because here the Industrial Revolution did not lead to an undue expansion in the population of one element at the expense of another, but led rather to the importation of foreign labour. An exception may

be made to this statement in the case of the Negroes. It is quite possible that if Eli Whitney had not invented the cotton gin, slavery would have died out in the South, as it early did in the North, because it was economically unprofitable. The Civil War with its terrible loss of white blood would not have been fought, and the Negroes would not now number upwards of 12,000,000. However, this is mere speculation.

It was stated above that the population of America would have been as large as it is now without immigration, and would have been far more homogeneous. Let us consider what this population was and how it is changing. To begin with, the continent of North America three centuries ago presented the greatest opportunity for the development of a pure white Nordic race that the world has ever seen. The Indian population was small in numbers and would not work. If they had been willing workers like the Negroes, they would have been enslaved and would have mixed their blood with the whites. As it was they were driven out and now form a negligible factor in our population. The continent, omitting always French Quebec and the Spanish-speaking countries to the South, was settled by the most virile population in Europe—that is, by the English of almost pure Nordic stock. The immigration of the seventeenth century was from the portions of England where the Nordic blood was purest, and occurred nearly two hundred years before the Industrial Revolution brought about the expansion of the old Mediterranean dark types, so it is safe to assume that the Americans of the seventeenth century—for that matter, like the English themselves of that period—were more Nordic than the inhabitants of England are today.

One hears on every side statements that Americans like the English are a mixed people:

Norman and Saxon and Dane are we,  
But all of us Dane in our welcome to thee,  
Alexandra!

was said in England in all seriousness, as though Norman and Saxon and Dane were different ethnical elements. In the same way a generation ago in this country it was fashionable to claim a mixed origin and to emphasize non-English lines of family

ancestry. As a matter of fact, it all came to the same thing in America, because all these ancestors were substantially Nordic. One hears about the Dutch in New York, the Germans in Pennsylvania and the Irish in the mountains of the South. The Dutch were overwhelmingly Nordic, and so were most of the French Huguenots mixed in with them. The Irish (so-called) of Revolutionary times were Scotch-Irish, mostly from Ulster, that is, men born in Ireland but whose parents or grandparents were born in Scotland. In these men there was not one drop of the blood of the South Irish who were widely sundered by race, religion and culture, and the name "Scotch-Irish" is therefore unfortunate and misleading.

As to what the actual population of Colonial America was, we are able to form some estimate. The men who settled the country, who fought long and bloody wars with the Indians and with the French, who established our independence, who formulated that amazing document, the Constitution of the United States, who expanded from the Alleghenies to the Pacific Ocean in less than a century, and who have established these forty-eight States—these men were almost without exception the descendants of the immigrants of the seventeenth century. We know what the composition of the population was in 1790 from the estimates based on the official census reports, which contain details showing not the race but the nationality of the various elements in the population.<sup>1</sup> These statistics are somewhat startling when seen for the first time, but prove that the country was overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon and nothing else.

The population of pure English origin was eighty-three and a half per cent. of the whole; the Scotch population, six and seven-tenths per cent.; the Dutch, two per cent.; the Irish (Scotch-Irish), one and six-tenths per cent.

All these elements can be considered as substantially Nordic and make a total percentage of ninety-three and eight-tenths per cent. in the whole population. In the balance we have five and six-tenths per cent. Germans. These Germans were partly Swiss and Alsatian,—in other words, from the southwestern German populations,—and were very largely Alpine.

<sup>1</sup> *A Century of Population Growth*, U. S. Census Bureau.

The French numbered one-half of one per cent. They also were largely Nordic, being mostly refugees from Rochelle, even today a Nordic district. There were, however, Protestant refugees from Southern France who may not have come from the Nordic classes there. It would therefore appear that the population of the United States in 1790 was over ninety-three per cent. Nordic. It is to be noted how trifling are the percentages of the Dutch and Irish—two per cent., and one and six-tenths per cent., respectively.

Such, therefore, was the racial composition of the native Americans, and such it continued to be down to the middle of the nineteenth century. Beginning in the latter 'forties we had a large influx of Irish, some of whom were of Nordic blood but many of them of Mediterranean race and, in the case of the Firbolgs, of still earlier races. A year or so later there came a large influx of Germans, who in this case were very largely Nordic and were a much more desirable racial element than were the German peasant immigrants of the eighteenth century. These were the only two foreign elements of importance in America down to the Civil War, and both of these elements were chiefly Nordic. These foreigners caused much disturbance, especially the Irish, who demoralized our municipal politics, but they did not fundamentally change the ethnic composition of the population. This change began with the industrial expansion after the Civil War, and with the need for cheap labour in the feverish development of the country at that time. Railroads were built over the western prairies with great rapidity, and manufacturing plants sprang up in the industrial centers, creating an increasing demand for labour. This labour poured into the country, some of it good Nordic stock, but bringing with it an undue proportion of the incompetent, the insane and the criminal. It is an open secret that we have received from each country its most undesirable races and classes, and it is also undeniable that this immigration has been fostered quasi-officially by the Governments which were desirous of unloading on us their social discards. Our jails, our insane asylums and our hospitals are choked with these foreigners, and it is only a question of time when the burden of the support of these institutions will become intolerable.

Low as is the average intelligence of our population, as revealed

by the Army intelligence tests, it is nevertheless far higher than the average of the immigrants we have been receiving from southern and southeastern Europe. In fact, according to a statement made recently by Dr. H. H. Laughlin before the Immigration Committee of the House, we have taken in since 1900 over 6,000,000 who were graded as "inferior" or "very inferior"—that is, far below the average intelligence of the white population, so that not only will the blood of the native American be mongrelized by these alien hordes, but the average intelligence of the country will be steadily reduced by the newcomers.

In the foregoing figures we find the real justification of the most severe restriction. There are many who think we could get along without any immigration. This was undoubtedly true half a century ago, but as things are now it may be that the Nordic blood in this country needs outside reinforcement, in view of the falling birth rate of the native Americans. If this be so, it would be the part of wisdom to discriminate heavily in favour of the Nordic countries, in order to attract to this country reinforcements of the blood that made America what it is.

If we admit immigration in large numbers from Nordic countries we shall, of course, still get some undesirable elements. This can be met by an intelligence examination such as was used in the army. With this in thorough application, we can obtain a high class of Nordics who would help maintain the ethnic preponderance of the native American.

One thing is certain, that while native Americans have not intermarried to any great extent with the newcomers, nevertheless within the long run such intermixture will take place. Social and legal restrictions of miscegenation will postpone the evil day, but eventually where two races live side by side they will amalgamate. The science of eugenics may in the future develop along lines that will minimize this danger, but as things are now and as they have been throughout recorded history, propinquity leads to miscegenation. It is almost too late, but even now much can be done through wise restriction of immigration and through the application of the principles of race eugenics to check the evils of the Melting Pot.

MADISON GRANT.